UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/669,953	09/23/2003	Yuichi Tamaoki	100529	4756
	7590 08/11/201 I, HATTORI, DANIEL	EXAMINER		
1250 CONNECTICUT AVENUE, NW SUITE 700 WASHINGTON, DC 20036			BEISNER, WILLIAM H	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			1797	
			NOTIFICATION DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			08/11/2010	ELECTRONIC

## Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

patentmail@whda.com

## Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief

Application No.	Applicant(s)	
10/669,953	TAMAOKI ET AL.	
Examiner	Art Unit	

	WILLIAM H. BEISNER	1797	
The MAILING DATE of this communication appe	ars on the cover sheet with th	ne correspondence add	ress
THE REPLY FILED <u>04 August 2010</u> FAILS TO PLACE THIS A	PPLICATION IN CONDITION F	OR ALLOWANCE.	
1. The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on application, applicant must timely file one of the following application in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Apple for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 Comperiods:	the same day as filing a Notice replies: (1) an amendment, affic eal (with appeal fee) in compliar	of Appeal. To avoid abai lavit, or other evidence, v ice with 37 CFR 41.31; o	which places the (3) a Request
a) The period for reply expires 3 months from the mailing date b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this A no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire Is Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or ( MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(	dvisory Action, or (2) the date set fo ater than SIX MONTHS from the ma b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN	illing date of the final rejection	on.
Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of exunder 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b) NOTICE OF APPEAL	ension and the corresponding amount chortened statutory period for reply of than three months after the mailing	unt of the fee. The appropri originally set in the final Offic	ate extension fee be action; or (2) as
2. The Notice of Appeal was filed on A brief in comp filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any externation Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed water MAMENDMENTS	nsion thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e))	, to avoid dismissal of the	
3. The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, I  (a) They raise new issues that would require further core  (b) They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE belo  (c) They are not deemed to place the application in bet	nsideration and/or search (see Nw);	NOTE below);	
appeal; and/or (d) They present additional claims without canceling a one NOTE: (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)).	corresponding number of finally	rejected claims.	
<ul> <li>4. ☐ The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.12</li> <li>5. ☐ Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s)</li> </ul>			
<ul> <li>6. Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be al non-allowable claim(s).</li> <li>7. For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a)</li> </ul>	·	·	_
how the new or amended claims would be rejected is prove The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:  Claim(s) allowed:  Claim(s) objected to:  Claim(s) rejected: 1,2 and 6.  Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:		will be entered and an e	Apianation of
AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE			
<ol> <li>The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, bu because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e).</li> </ol>			
<ol> <li>The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to o showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary</li> </ol>	vercome <u>all</u> rejections under ap	peal and/or appellant fail	s to provide a
10. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanatio REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER	n of the status of the claims afte	r entry is below or attach	ed.
<ol> <li>The request for reconsideration has been considered bu See Continuation Sheet.</li> </ol>	t does NOT place the applicatio	n in condition for allowan	ce because:
<ul><li>12. ☐ Note the attached Information <i>Disclosure Statement</i>(s).</li><li>13. ☐ Other:</li></ul>	PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)	_	
	/William H. Beisner/		
	Primary Examiner, A	t Unit 1797	

Continuation of 11. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: With respect to the 35 USC 112, 1st. paragraph rejection of record, Applicants argue that the originally filed disclosure provides support for a separate door for each opening (See pages 5-7 of the response filed 8/4/10). In response, the Examiner respectfully disagrees. Paragraph [0042] of the instant application clearly conveys to one of ordinary skill in the art that the body (22) has "an opening" and the body has "a door" for blocking the incubation spaces respectively which would be interpreted as a single door blocking both spaces. In response to applicants' comments that there is no logical way to control the gas concentration in each space with a single door, the Examiner directs applicants to Fig. 13 of the reference of US '292 which discloses individual spaces sealed by a single door. With respect to the 35 USC 103 rejections of record, Applicants argue that the newly amended claim language clarifies and defines the instant invention over the prior art rejections of record (See pages 7-10 of the response filed 8/4/10). In response, the Examiner maintains that the current prior art rejections of record address the individual control of each of the incubation spaces.